

Letters to the Tribune

BY

EDGAR D. BRINKERHOFF

PAMPHLET PUBLISHING CO.

FALL RIVER, MASS.

Letters to the Tribune

BY

EDGAR D. BRINKERHOFF

COMPLIMENTS OF
E. D. BRINKERHOFF

PAMPHLET PUBLISHING CO.

FALL RIVER, MASS.

**This is the second
of the Scoundrel Series
of Pamphlets**

PHILOLOGY

From the New York Tribune of 1907, Dec. 31.

ENGLISH OR FRENCH?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I am getting tired of your persistent use of the word approachment. You have been keeping this up for several years, and it seems high time now to remind you that you might as well begin the word with an "r," according to the dictionaries.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

New York, December 30, 1907.

LAND

From the New York Tribune of 1910, April 10.

LAND AND CAPITAL.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In an editorial in The Tribune of April 4 the editor says: "The farmer is a business man, and his land is his capital." But the question arises what reason the writer has for confusing terms. It has for a long time been understood that the farmer is a business man, and that he uses land, and that he uses capital, and that his land is one thing and that his capital is another thing. Will the editor kindly tell us what benefit accrues from so redefining these terms as to leave no specific term for what used to be known as capital, namely, exclusive of land?

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

New York, April 7, 1910.

From the New York Tribune of 1911, Dec. 3.

LAND TAXES.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The Tribune is entitled to much commendation for the advanced stand it takes on public questions in general, but an editorial on land tax a day or two ago was peculiarly disappointing. I am no Single Taxer, but the devil should have his due. If there is any well established economic doctrine it is that the cost of commodities is not enhanced by the taxation of land to its full rental value. Even if there were no other able advocates, every ordinary Single Taxer stands ready to present the argument of great authorities that a land tax cannot be shifted to the consumer. A house is a commodity. Owners of tenements or apartment houses now have to be reimbursed for interest on investment including land, while under a heavy land tax system they would not look for returns on investment in land, as it would cost nothing. Therefore, no higher rental for flats would be necessary to offset depreciation, as the latter would be as fully taken care of by the saving in interest as formerly covered by the enhancement in selling value of the land. The same consideration holds as to home buyers, who will save in interest on investment at least as much as they will lose by the failure of their land to increase.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

Irrington, N. J., Nov. 27, 1911.

From the New York Tribune of 1911, Dec. 16.

ENHANCING LAND VALUES.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A number of writers in The Tribune recently have asserted that the unearned increment is created by the community through its industrial activities. It is high time that this false doctrine was combated. The relation between the rental value of land and the presence of the community is only secondary. The primary factor in the enhancement of land values is the attitude of the community toward the claimants of land. Supposing that ten men should claim nearly all the land of North America, and supposing that the government should recognize this claim; it follows that the rest of the land of this continent would at once become very valuable and would soon yield a great rental. But if the supposition were to be changed so that the state would recognize only very small claims, and the rest of the land be declared open for future claimants in very small parcels, the opposite result would follow and American land would cease to command any very high price. This shows how much more effect the laws of land tenure have upon land rentals than the mere presence of the community. Through land laws, the state creates unearned increment, which is another name for land monopoly.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

Irvington, N. J., Dec. 8, 1911.

From the New York Tribune of 1914, July 29.

THE SINGLE TAX IN MEXICO.

How It Would Work There, According to a Correspondent.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Some of your contributors are advising the single tax for Mexico, but this is superficial advice. Under present circumstances the annual rental value would be very high and would furnish a huge income for public expenses, or at least for graft purposes. But the single tax is supposed to change the face of the world, and it would; in a short time land would be so plentiful that the rental value collected from it would not run the government.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

Fall River, Mass., July 25, 1914.

WORLD FEDERATION

From the New York Tribune of 1916 April 16.

THE TRIBUNE OFFENDS HIM.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: One gets tired reading rot in the newspapers and is tempted to boycott the whole mess. Here comes The Tribune sagely asking, "Are We Prepared?" in big letters, and sagely whining that Forts Wadsworth and Hamilton and the Boston forts have only some three hundred each in their garrisons.

Does not The Tribune know that these forts are not intended for use in real war? Does not The Tribune know that General Sherman told us many years ago to protect our seacoast by underground forts invisible to the foe and even unknown to our civilian population? We naturally expect better things of The Tribune.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

New York, April 10, 1916.

From the New York Tribune of 1915, March 30.

A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Prominent Americans have recently been advocating a United States of Europe. The writer wonders how they can regard such proposal with anything less than dismay. A question that answers itself is, What would become of the United States of America, China, Japan, Brazil and the other governments of South America?

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

New York, March 17, 1915.

From the New York Tribune of 1915, May 27.

THE DESIRE FOR PEACE WILL NOT PROTECT US.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I want to congratulate you on your outspoken editorial on the attitude of Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler and others toward world politics. The desire for peace will not protect us. Neither will the friendly feeling for a United States of Europe protect us. This is

not Dr. Butler's only political blunder. His three books, "True and False Democracy," "The American as He Is" and "Why Should We Change Our Form of Government?" are full of notions that have long been dispelled in the minds of every deep student of politics.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

Fall River, Mass., May 22, 1915.

From the New York Tribune of 1915, April 23.

A FEDERATION OF THE WORLD.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A writer in The Tribune of April 18 states that an enlightened, prosperous and flourishing nation, or body of nations, is not a menace to the rest of the world. He states that two big, prosperous nations, side by side, will not fight like cats tied by the tails and thrown over a clothesline. One is prompted to ask him "Never?" How can he say "Hardly ever?" To an observer the national governments of the world do not seem to get along together much better than fifty or sixty anarchists. It would seem as if they need something like an international court of justice, backed up by a good big navy and army, supported by taxation not lacking in the enforcement principle, and all the other appurtenances of a limited central government. A United States of Europe would prolong the agony and result in an ancient Rome, while a United Nations of Earth would give mankind one more chance.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

Fall River, Mass., April 19, 1915.

MONEY

From the New York Tribune of 1907, Dec. 21.

CURRENCY BASED ON VALUE.

Correspondent Thinks Theory Worthy of Consideration.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The article of two or three days ago on "Currency Based on Value" departs from the usual dignified and sensible tenor of The Tribune. It is far from sensible to suppose that in the long run any money could be made by withholding commodities from use. Land will appreciate in value if withheld from use, but land is a different thing.

Neither is it sensible to suppose that money would continue to be issued after it ceased to bring the issuer a profit. Overabundance of money destroys interest, and there comes a time when the borrower must liquidate.

If the editor was not serious in his expressions of fear regarding the outcome of putting the value basis theory into practice, he stands convicted of want of dignity for the two following reasons:

The subject is too momentous to admit of trivial treatment.

In the second place, the value basis theory is worthy of consideration. Not that it has always been presented in workable form, by Senator McLaurin and others, but it was the editor's duty to discover the good element in the various propositions and discard the unworkable accompaniments.

The editor has things mixed, any way. It is not value, but wealth, that it is proposed to utilized as the basis of money.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

New York, Dec. 17, 1907.

From the New York Tribune of 1908, Jan. 16.

CURRENCY BASED ON BORROWER'S NOTE.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: That was a very good proposal of yours—in The Tribune of January 9, in the editorial entitled "The Aldrich Bill"—to base currency on borrowers' notes indorsed by banks. You speak of such notes as the natural and normal investments of banks.

What the borrowers' notes shall be founded upon you seem to leave to the bank. This is your weak point. If there is to be a new federal law, let it instil correct monetary principles. Let the federal government refuse to furnish currency to banks for such paper as is not secured by wealth. Banks must be given no opportunity to degrade the national currency by accepting such collateral as personal honor, land, franchises or any value whatsoever except wealth.

Currency, based on anything other than some form of wealth cannot be called money. The connection between currency and wealth must be made distinct and definite.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

New York, Jan. 9, 1908.

From the New York Tribune of 1908, Feb. 22.

REPLIES TO REPRESENTATIVE FOWLER.

E. D. Brinkerhoff Says, "Gold Is an Infernal Basis When All Others are Excluded."

In an open letter sent to Representative Charles N. Fowler, chairman of the Committee of Banking and Currency, Edgar D. Brinkerhoff, of No. 32 Broadway, calls attention to the alleged contradictions made by the Congressman in a lecture before the Illinois Manufacturers' Association on December 10, 1907. "Gold is an excellent standard, but an infernal basis when all other bases are excluded," says Mr. Brinkerhoff. "In advocating a gold reserve you are receding from your position that commodities are a proper basis for currency. We credited the banks with the ability to pay gold, and at last we woke up to the fact that we had been too credulous."

Mr. Brinkerhoff adds that credit should be limited to checks, drafts and the ten or thirty day time limits necessary to convenience.

From the New York Tribune of 1912, Feb. 1.

INTEREST ON MONEY TO BUY OUT THE LANDHOLDERS.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Mayor Gaynor's opinion of the Sullivan-Shortt bill is to be expected of a single taxpayer with the exception of his hesitancy about confiscating land values that already exist. From one point of view nothing would be gained for the community to exchange land for money; for if the compensated landowners should invest the money at 4 per cent and leave it at interest, every \$1,000 would be worth more than all the wealth in the world to-day in less than the lifetime of a Methusaleh. How could a community prosper with such an interest bill to pay? Why does not Mayor Gaynor hesitate about advising the community to consider the question of borrowing money to pay off all these land holders?

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

Irvington, N. J., Jan. 27, 1912.

From the New York Tribune of 1913, Dec. 18.

IN REPLY TO DR. JOHNSON.

The Theory of Shifting Reserves from Point to Point is Attacked.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In his excellent article on currency in *The Tribune* of December 7 Dr. Joseph French Johnson tells us how to nip panic in the bud. He says that we must accumulate our money reserves in a large reservoir and be able to send them at once to the spot where they are needed. It does not seem to occur to him that there is any lack of integrity about this method. He calls our attention to the fact that our banks owe their depositors twenty billions of dollars and have less than two billions on hand to pay them with. The fraudulency is not visible until we recollect that these deposits are repayable on demand. Bankers know that they cannot pay on demand in times of stress, so the tacit agreement to repay on demand is rank dishonesty.

Dr. Johnson's remedy would perpetuate our present deceitful system. He says: "Bankers deal in credit and credit rests upon confidence." Now, it happens that confidence itself should rest upon something safe and sane and sound and hard. Confidence should not rest upon successful deceit. He says that what is wanted is a banking system that will automatically bring to any one of the sections of our country the strength of all in time of need. Yes, rush the reserves around from one point to another where most needed in the effort to restore confidence in what? Why, in the belief that there is plenty of gold when there is not!

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

New York, Dec. 13, 1913.

From the New York Tribune of 1913, Dec. 26.

ONE VIEW OF OUR PUBLICISTS.

They Know Nothing of the Science of Finance, It Is Asserted.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Senator Root's warning against inflation was timely, which is the only thing that can be said in its favor. The Owen-Glass bill forges ahead just the same, except that it now presents a face 60 per cent dishonest instead of its former dishonorable 70 per cent. But, had the warning been fully heeded, the bill would now be providing for reserves of 100 per cent, a *reductio ad absurdum*. Locking up a dollar of gold to keep afloat a dollar of paper does not look like providing an elastic currency. The reserve idea seems to be incompatible with honesty on one side and the required circulating medium on the other.

The helplessness of our public men is appalling. In their despair they grope about for something to take the place of gold as a medium

of exchange, a medium that was about sufficient before the great development of modern business. Greenbacks will not answer, Sherman notes are nearly as bad, gold certificates take us nowhere, labor checks are the worst ever, national bank notes are inelastic, wildcat banking is to be shunned, and nobody has proposed anything that is worthy of attention.

One would hardly suppose that there is a science of money. There can be no monetary light in the mind of any person who does not know what a standard is and what is the best standard, what a basis is and what is the best basis, and how to make the proper connection between the basis and the standard. Not a word has escaped from the lips or pen of any economist or publicist to show that he knows the A, B, C of finance. All seem to be in the boat with Senator Root, who vetoes inflation, but has nothing positive and expert to offer.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

New York, Dec. 23, 1913.

From the New York Tribune of 1914, Jan. 1.

THE CURRENCY BILL.

It Is Only a Small Beginning, Asserts a Reader.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Now is the time to discuss the money question. While the currency bill was pending in Congress one could not be heard for the babel of voices, and it also savored of cruelty to say anything to clarify ideas at a time when the very indefiniteness of thought was a factor helping to put on the statute books a measure that would at least calm the country's fears of a panic. The writer of this letter feels that he has a mission to perform to-day very similar to the one he was enacting just twenty years ago, when he narrowly escaped mobbing at the hands of an angry audience of New York bankers and business men for having denounced with little reservation the iniquitous national banking law as it stood at that time.

The money problem is not solved by the Owen-Glass law. Panic is made less threatening, but the remedy is about as bad as the disease. We have only copied Europe in putting into the hands of certain officials the power and duty of heading off panic. But panics should not be checked; they should be welcomed, for under wise public finance no one could lose except those that deserved to lose. In this hour of my triumph let me say that in repealing the old banking law we have only taken the first step toward sound money, and not a constructive step either. The new currency measure builds nothing, as time will prove. Now that the danger element has been minimized it is not too soon to begin to analyze the new law's provisions and compare them with others not new in the world's experience.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

New York, Dec. 27, 1913.

DEMOCRACY

From the New York Tribune of 1914, July 17.

WANTS DEMOCRACY DEFINED.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I want to unite with E. W. Van Valkenburgh in requesting Mr. Brennan to state his definition of democracy. And I would extend this invitation to all other readers. There is so little reason to believe that any tenable definition will be forthcoming that I promise to offer a good one after all others have failed. No egotism is involved for the reason that I am

A DEMOCRATIC DEMOCRAT.

Tompkinsville, Staten Island, July 9, 1914.

From the New York Tribune of 1914, July 27.

WHAT IS DEMOCRACY?

A Plea for a Definition.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A definition of democracy should distinguish democracy from everything else in the universe. Theodore Michel's definition does not meet this test. He points to American democracy, but his interpretations are not correct. He claims that our government officials represent the people, but it is evident that they represent only a majority of the people. The majority, not the people, rule. Social and political equality is pointed to as an element of democracy, but it is plain that equality is not a necessary element of democracy except when this term is used merely as opposed to aristocracy. Democracy is described as a growth; so is a tree a growth. Democracy is called a natural growth; but we may some day call the present system unnatural or not nature's best, and turn it down as we did chattel slavery. It is asserted that the founders of our government did not intend to form a ruling class, but it is manifest that that was precisely their intention, namely to make the majority the ruling class.

Will somebody please give us a definition of democracy?

A DEMOCRATIC DEMOCRAT.

Tompkinsville, N. Y., July 20, 1914.

From the New York Tribune of 1914, Aug. 6.

WHAT IS DEMOCRACY?

A "Democrat" Still Unsatisfied with Definitions Offered.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The attempt of E. W. Van Valkenburgh to define democracy is a failure. To see this we have only to string together the various definitions or parts of a definition: "Equality of opportunity," "Right to develop," "Granting of education to the majority," "Industrial organization of society." Democracy evidently is not equality or rights or charity or organizing. How could the term be made broad enough to include all of these things at once?

Our East Orange contributor may have in mind the consequences of his ideal democracy; but what is democracy itself? He states that democracy means more than the right to vote, but he does not say how much must be added to this right to bring it up to democracy. He also states that it used to be satisfactory to define it as government by the people; but he does not explain what is wrong about this definition. He virtually tells us that government by the people is a failure, but he has not made it plain what this failure has to do with democracy.

We seem to be sadly in need of a definition of democracy.

A DEMOCRATIC DEMOCRAT.

New York, July 29, 1914.

From the New York Tribune of 1912, Feb. 27.

MAJORITIES AND JURIES.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: One is startled by the statement in a recent Tribune editorial, entitled "Majority Verdicts," that "much might be said in favor of permitting the vote of less than twelve men to convict, at least of the lesser crimes." And the editor cites certain arguments in favor of the change, among them the avoidance of retrials, the saving of delay in choosing juries, the lessening of the danger of jury corruption and the prevention of waste of time in the conduct of trials. These improvements are much to be desired, but it is a question whether the remedy is not worse than the disease. If the proposition were to enable eleven men to convict, it might possibly still be successfully contended that the essence of the jury system idea had been preserved. But the editor's endeavor does not seem to be directed so conservatively, but, rather, he argues for "verdicts by a two-thirds or three-fourths vote of the jury," to use his own words, or, in his own words again, "eight or nine of the jurymen." Again, note his statement as follows: "A verdict by three-fourths or two-thirds of a jury would be likely to be common sense; accordingly, common sense would be uppermost in the trial."

This is a very serious question. It is customary to look upon the jury system as the palladium of our liberties. The supreme value of a jury system is that it furnishes a check upon the foolish governor. The governed need protection from the governor, whether the latter be king or majority. It is a question whether the citizen does not need more protection against the majority than against the king; for there are some good kings, while there can be no such thing as a good majority. The majority in this country have made a hundred thousand foolish laws. Any lawyer will tell you so. The jury stands between the law and the victim. This proposition to emasculate the jury seems to strike at the vitals of safe government.

Only on account of the inconvenience of a convention of thousands of people we draw jurymen at random to represent the whole community. When one-third of a jury votes to acquit it means perhaps a probable ten thousand in the community opposed to conviction. When the editor advocates disregarding these ten thousand people he becomes sponsor for a despotism of the blackest sort. Majority government would lack common sense, as the very words import. The common sense of the majority is only majority sense. When the majority disagrees with the minority there is no sense in common between the two. The editor's eight jurymen have sense that is common to the eight, but they have not sense that is common to the twelve.

In every community are found cranks, the stupid, the biassed, the dishonest, as the editor calls them. The question arises whether the proportion of people of this stripe approaches anywhere near to the one-twelfth mark. If so, some such might often get on a jury. Granting all this, the position might with some reason be taken that one dissenting voice on a jury could justly be disregarded. This would be a very different thing from advocating the annulling of the political rights of one-third or one-fourth of the community, or, in other words, empowering two-thirds of the jurymen to represent more than eleven-twelfths of the people.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

New York, Feb. 17, 1912.

SOCIALISM

From the New York Tribune of 1914, July 18.

TOO MUCH PATERNALISM.

So Thinks a Disbeliever in Governmental Regulation.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: It is proposed to subject the sale and use of dictographs to governmental regulation to protect private parties from undesired publicity. The answer is not that there is anything extremely wrong about such protection, although it does seem that a few things should be left for the individual to look out for himself rather than that everything should be done for him by a paternal of some sort; but the true answer is, how can the editor of The Tribune and Lawyer Ernst think up so many unimportant things for the "Little Father" to do when there are such glaring enormities remaining unmentioned?

There are already about two hundred thousand American laws that nobody reads, and yet it is proposed to add more for comparatively unimportant purposes. It is exceedingly strange that the censors never get tired. Why do they not sit back restfully once in a while and let the world go on somewhat in its own way, just to see whether chaos would come?

I wonder if some invention will not yet be made that will perforce silence the busybodies forever; for instance, when radium becomes such an everyday matter that any one can adjust his spectacles to see through bricks and mortar and floors. The editor says in the July 11 issue, "It seems inevitable that governmental authority should invade more and more the field of private enterprise as science advances and such discoveries and inventions multiply." In passing it might be remarked that if scientific advancement means more laws and regulations and repressions and more armies of lawmakers, lawyers, spies and sheriffs, good Lord, deliver us from discoveries and inventions!

But we need not wait (and wish) for all this. Why not at once set governmental authority busy on something important; for example, protecting the community from land grabbing?

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

Fall River, Mass., July 11, 1914.

From the New York Tribune of 1910, Feb. 1.

TRADE CONDITIONS.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Under date of January 27 The Tribune contains the following:

"But when a few individuals or corporations corner the market for a necessity of life they commit a cumulative offence against millions of victims, doing the greatest wrong to the most helpless members of society. . . . If the country is to maintain its present competitive system in industry, trade and production, free markets must be restored. Restraint of trade must be done away with and the monopolist and forestaller dealt with in his true character."

No combine of corporations or individuals can monopolize or manipulate the market for the necessities of life at its own sweet will. If there were a free market it could do nothing of the kind. Cornering the market would be an impossibility if it were not for existing innocent looking laws that furnish the basis for successful restraint of trade.

The way to restore free markets is not to nag people that do business, but to repeal the laws that prevent the markets from being free. I do not refer to the tariff law—that is a small matter.

The dangerous end of this business is that this constant regulation of business men, the benefactors of the community, leads direct to socialism.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

New York, Jan. 28, 1910.

From the New York Tribune of 1910, Feb. 7.

THE BEEF SUPPLY.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In The Tribune of February 1 appears the following comments on a free market:

"Yet economic law has not operated to stimulate agriculture, because the returns from steadily mounting prices have not really reached the producer. Thirty years ago the fattening of steers for the local markets was common in the East. But when the vast Western ranges were opened and the great packing houses were established, the cheapness of range beef, refrigerated and delivered in Eastern cities, was used as a weapon to kill off the cattle industry of the East. When the Eastern cattleman was driven out of business the price of beef rose. . . . Were there a free market for the Eastern raiser of stock, milk and food products generally, with the middleman's commissions properly restricted, Eastern farming would probably be profitable."

The artificial element that interferes with the freedom of the market is not the packer nor the middleman. Neither should be restricted. They cannot possibly corner anything of themselves.

The artificial element is the product of lawmakers who have contrived to legislate against the Western range man, against the Eastern farmer and against the packer himself. All are suffering from the effects of unwise regulation, and now the only remedy that occurs to some people is more regulation.

What this country needs is an extension of the principle of the conservation of natural resources and a restriction of the principle that underlies national banking.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

New York, Feb. 2, 1910.

From the New York Tribune of 1914, May 8.

PRAISE FOR THE ROCKEFELLERS.

Strikers Are Called Spoiled Children with Fantastic Ideas.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: It is about time that somebody came to the rescue of the Rockefellers. Things have come to a pretty pass when the owners of great wealth have not the same rights as other people. When the clerks in a little grocery store do not like their job, they strike, and that is all there is of it. They are not sympathized with when they threaten, riot, commit arson and murder. The United States government does not send the little merchant telegrams advising him to confer with the strikers. The strikers do not seem to feel that they own the little man's shop.

Presto! Change! How different when the business is a big one! The owner becomes an object of hatred, and even his life is threatened, and wiseacres express the opinion that he should at least enter into a conference. How is it that mere magnitude changes justice into injustice?

I admire the Rockefeller refusal to treat with the unions, especially those who want to arbitrate the open shop. Arbitrating with a union is an acknowledgment that the union is rightfully entitled to a part ownership in the capital devoted to production. Strikers are spoiled children. They have been conferred with until they have come actually to believe that the business man administers a trust for the good of his partners, the workers and strikers.

There are some people who have made their money honestly and legally, Ida Tarbell to the contrary notwithstanding. If they made their money too easily in some instances, it is no more than the strikers would have done had the opportunity presented. If they sometimes took advantage of a monopoly law, who made this monopoly law but the voter? If they have more money than it is good for one citizen to

have, it is not half so sensible to resort to violence as it is to employ the American method and elect representatives to find out what really is the matter, if anything.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

Fall River, Mass., May 4, 1914.

From the New York Tribune of 1914, June 15.

THE COLORADO DISPUTE.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Hope springs eternal in the human breast. This is all that keeps me from despairing of ever getting anything like common sense out of our everyday publicists. Professor John Bates Clark asserts that fundamental justice was with the Colorado miners, in that their original and chief contention was for the right to bargain collectively with their employers. Wrong, professor! The strikers' chief contention was that their employers had no right to refuse to bargain with them. And I should not wonder if the professor's twisted conscience would also approve of that same proposition that the employers had no right of refusal, or even to shut down their plant had they so chosen. Then, in all consistency let the professor arbitrate his watch or his pocketbook when the next footpad comes along in threatening mood. Nor let him call in any friendly assistance, as that would be too much like hiring strikebreakers, whom he regards as a sort of hired constabulary inspiring murderous feelings in the striking laborers. And yet it would be safe to wager a thousand to one that Professor Clark never heard of an instance in which a strikebreaker ever bothered a striker who kept away.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

New York, June 6.

From the New York Tribune of 1914, July 3.

AN ADMONITION TO STRIKERS.

Don't Look for Trouble and You Won't Find It.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In the Tribune of May 8 Mr. Herman Michelson takes me to task for my defence of the Rockefellers, and in the issue of June 16 he overhauls me vigorously for my views on strikes. He applies the epithets "profound stupidity," "utter ignorance," "latest performance," and "unheard of depths of ignorance." It is difficult to answer logic of this description.

He claims that those who grub in the bowels of the earth are entitled to a part ownership in the capital devoted to production. But this seems to confuse the product of production with the tools of

production. He asserts that the mine owners are themselves organized for the express purpose of bargaining with the miners, and seems to think that this justifies the miners in insisting on a bargain. But has Mr. Michelson forgotten that the essence of a bargain is the freedom of both traders? Since when has the general willingness of a trader to trade been construed as a basis to compel him to trade? Again, he claims that violence, disorder and riot come with the strike breaker. But the strike breaker cannot fight alone. There must be somebody else around. The question is whether strikers get hurt if they keep away and mind their own business instead of their employer's business.

Mr. Michelson's position in this matter reminds me of the countryman who visited New York for the first time. He picked a quarrel with many people he met in the streets the first day. At last he bumped against a policeman and returned in a threatening attitude. He soon found himself in the station house. On discharging the prisoner the judge remarked that any right-minded person could walk the streets of the city year in and year out without getting into a row with anybody.

There is not the slightest doubt that if strikers will cease to look for trouble they will not have any. Mr. Michelson's trouble is that he does not know the real causes of inequality, and therefore seeks the wrong remedy.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

Fall River, Mass., June 29, 1914.

From the New York Tribune of 1914, June 29.

AIDING AND ABETTING SOCIALISM.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: John Wanamaker is quoted as a confessed believer in government ownership of public utilities. Other good people are known to be in the same boat. It would be interesting to know whether these persons are aware that they thus aid and abet socialism. Do they know that government ownership of railroads and other so-called public utilities will lead directly to the goal aimed at by these radicals? Is it possible that a man with the otherwise level head of Mr. Wanamaker is willing to see our present order subverted in favor of a system that has never yet secured a first class mind as a convert? Or, on the other hand, does the great merchant prince assume that we can adopt public utility socialism without descending into the rapids of the whole atrocious and hateful doctrine?

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

New York, June 23, 1914.

From the New York Tribune of 1914, July 10.

POSTOFFICE DEFICITS CITED.

An Example of what to Expect Under Socialism, He Thinks.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: For the edification of Arthur Brooks Baker, I will say that a volume could be written of the shortcomings and dangers of the government's postal system, to say nothing of its millions of deficit in the past and also its prospective parcel post deficits, and to make no mention of the fact that its very existence depends on a law prohibiting mail carrying by those private companies that would gladly deliver, for instance, New York mail for one-quarter of Uncle Sam's charge. It will not be long before the government will have to pass a prohibition law of some kind to eliminate the parcel competition of Wells, Fargo & Co. and the Adams Express Company, so inefficient is the socialistic method.

Again, it takes a socialist to make the all-inclusive claim that only under socialism can exist such desirable institutions as public roads, parks, schoolhouses, bridges, lighthouses and health departments.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

Tompkinsville, Staten Island, July 3, 1914.

From the New York Tribune of 1912, Jan. 28.

A NON-SOCIALIST'S REPLY.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I cannot join with those who congratulate you for admitting to your columns that socialism article by John R. McMahon. Its tendency is to corrupt the public mind, and while I admire this example of fair play on your part, it is to be feared that The Tribune will never present an answer. Not many answers are likely to be offered, for nearly every one is socialistic, and nearly all the rest hesitate to antagonize public opinion, and many of us cannot afford to take the time to write a reply. In all justice, The Tribune should endeavor to repair the damage it has done by offering to pay some one to state the other side of the question. And let it be remembered that fair play requires that the answer should be prepared by some one who has not a trace of socialism in his fibre.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

Irvington, N. J., Jan. 27, 1912.

From the New York Tribune of 1912, Feb. 12.

AN INTERPRETATION.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In Dr. Pallen's cleverly written answer to John R. McMahon's article in favor of socialism we have a socialist answered by

a socialist. The answerer is opposed, but is himself guilty of the essential principles of socialism. Lest it may be imagined that the doctor did not drop anything savoring of socialism, and lest it may not be noted that he is a socialist without knowing it, witness the following extract from his final paragraph: "The picture (the socialists' indictment of the present social organization) is immensely overdrawn, is limned with pitch, radically falsifies the perspective and is a reckless calumny to boot." Any one but a conservative socialist knows that no pen has as yet painted the present failures in dark enough colors.

He continues: "Abuses there have been, abuses there are, under the present social organization, but many have been rectified and more will be rectified." No man not poisoned with the virus of socialism could have so much confidence in our present socialistic system. The answerer has not the slightest suspicion that present day evils are caused by the socialism inherent in our federal and state constitutions and in most of our national and local statutes. His objections have all been many times successfully answered. It will take something more than a socialist to give the socialists something that they cannot answer. Will not The Tribune make an attempt to get answered both McMahon's radical socialism and Pallen's far more dangerous conservative socialism?

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

Irrington, N. J., Feb. 2, 1912.

From the New York Tribune of 1912, Feb. 29.

THE ELUSIVE DOCTRINE.

Battledore and Shuttlecock with Friends and Foes of Socialism.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Again has The Tribune selected a socialist to answer the socialists. Dr. Schurman's socialistic trend is evident by his statement that such industries as railways, telegraphs, electric plants and water systems are inherently of a monopolistic character. Not a word of truth in it! No fully informed person will claim it. They are no more monopolistic than Harvard, Yale and Cornell. We see monopoly in them now, but instead of the monopoly being inherent in the peculiar industry it is outside of the industry and entirely unnecessary to it.

Yielding these industries to the socialists is dangerous. It is unwise to let things move in their direction. We are already drifting toward socialism, and Dr. Schurman adds to the danger by granting more and more to them. He applauds the regulation of industry, as if there were any real difference between regulation and the state ownership and operation of producers' goods and land. So far as the owner sees profits regulated away from him, he cares little whether the regulator calls himself socialist or not. Regulation and socialism may differ in degree, but they do not differ in kind. He also

credits socialism with the intention to stop at producer's goods or capital and to let consumers' goods alone, but a knowledge of human nature demonstrates that the movement would finally take in consumers' goods also. He credits socialists with being adherents of democracy, while in fact they are to a man advocates of majority rule. Democratic democracy is entirely foreign to the socialistic mind.

Even Dr. Schurman perceives that we are moving toward socialism, for he says: "If the socialists were not carried away by their dream of a universal, revolutionary reform they would find much to encourage them in the industrial changes taking place at the present time." These changes may please the socialists and Dr. Schurman, but they do not please me, for matters are getting worse and worse.

Lastly, Cornell's president evidences his socialism by calling attention approvingly to the co-operative societies and to profit sharing systems; but the proper way to look at these methods is that they are charity at best, and the industrial problem is to be solved by means just the opposite of these quasi-socialistic systems.

Where Dr. Schurman might properly have yielded something to the socialists he failed to see the opportunity to do so. In many of their criticisms of things as they are the socialists are correct. They should be commended for their stand that labor is the sole source of value. Is it not the only active factor? Is land an active factor? Are producers' goods an active factor?

Once more, will not The Tribune please select a non-socialist to answer the socialists?

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

New York, Feb. 26, 1912.

From the New York Tribune of 1908 June 22.

SOCIALISM'S POLITICAL SIDE.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In a May 30 editorial, entitled "Socialism Gone Astray," you fell into the very common error of failing to recognize a political side to socialism as well as an economic side. To say that compulsory insurance, the abolition of the President's veto, amending the Constitution by majority of voters instead of three-fourths majority of states, election of judges by the people for short terms and election of candidates by majorities only are not La Salle and Marx socialism is only to say that these doctrinaires hoped to reach economic results by some other route than majority rule. The above measures may not smack directly of the economic ideals of socialism, but they certainly lay the foundation for the rule of the bare majority, which is much more likely to evolve socialistic economy than control by a minority on one hand or a two-thirds majority on the other. The Socialists are as much afraid of a two-thirds majority as is the editor of The Tribune.

The two great political parties of this country are at present socialistic in their politics, whatever they may be in their economic leanings, but when they recognize that majorityism will bring certain social results the Republicans will advocate minority rule and the Democrats will clamor for government by two-thirds or three-fourths majority.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

New York, June 20, 1908.

From the New York Tribune of 1913, August.

THE CAUSE OF POVERTY.

It Is the Stupid Voters, Who Should Be Abolished.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In reply to Philip and Elsie Ebert's fourth question in to-day's Tribune, I would say that the cause of involuntary poverty is lack of opportunity.

In the main this lack of opportunity takes on the form of inequality of opportunity. The law of equal freedom is violated. In everyday language, monopoly exists.

And whose fault? Why, the voters'. Remedy, abolish the voter, and be quick about it; for if women get the vote it will be too late.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

New York, Aug. 1, 1913.

HEALTH

From the New York Tribune of 1908, Aug. 21.

CONSUMPTION AND COOKED FOOD.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The Tribune usually hits the mark in discussing medical topics, but its editorial on tuberculosis, August 10, fails to teach unadulterated truth. The main contention of the article is all right, namely, that this disease is transmitted by ingestion of food containing germs rather than by inhalation. But the article seems to go out of its way to assert that it is reasonable to believe that protection by inoculation will become feasible some day, and seems to yearn after this method, when, in truth, such protection will never be advisable, even if possible. As a second best remedy, the editorial offers keeping the germs from gaining admission to the body as, at present, the most effective plan, and advises a strict watch on the articles of diet. This may be science, but it is not philosophical science. Philosophy would say, "Make the body healthy and no malignant germ will live in it." And this would be safer advice, for it will hardly be possible to avoid germs without resort to cooking, and, of all the schemes concocted by man to undermine his health, the application of heat to food in frying, roasting, baking, broiling and boiling is the most effective to that dire end.

No writer on therapeutics is forgivable for dropping one word that will tend to perpetuate this greatest of all evils, the eating of cooked food. If consumption can be prevented in no other way, it will not be worth while to prevent it.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

New York, Aug. 17, 1908.

From the New York Tribune of 1908, Oct. 18.

DISAGREEMENT ON TUBERCULOSIS.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Things medical seem to get sadly mixed nowadays. What with the contradictory views expressed in the Academy of Medicine and the demonstration in honor of Robert Koch one day in the International Congress on Tuberculosis, while on another day the same body rejects his theories, one is justified in a feeling of bewilderment. When doctors disagree, how are voters and taxpayers and legislators

to decide? One thousand physicians in Europe and America stand ready to prevent consumption and make good their pretensions. Their method would take no note of the bacilli. In fact, they stand ready to eat whatever cultures of tuberculosis or cholera or diphtheria germs Koch or Von Behring may have to offer. Right habits of living are the greatest safeguards against disease. The appeal is to the individual, rather than the collectivity. No graft is involved. Boards of health are not requested to disburse millions of the people's money. With right habits, the individual cares not for germs, benignant or malignant. While cleanliness in the community is unobjectionable, much greater dependence is placed upon the cleanliness of the inside of the individual's person. It is denied that in discovering the bacillus of tuberculosis Dr. Koch furnished to the world the key to the nature of consumption. Rather it is held that the disease itself is prior and invites microbes that give form or symptom or effect to the disease, so that it becomes known as tuberculosis.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

New York, Oct. 13, 1908.

From the New York Tribune of 1915, May 7.

EAT POTATOES.

If You Do, You Need Nothing Else and Feel Fine.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: An account of rich findings respecting the food value of potatoes has been going the rounds of the newspapers. If the diet experts of the home economics department of Cornell University are correctly reported, they present an admixture of truth and error that should not be allowed to go unchallenged. Among the errors are the claims that starch vegetables should accompany meats in the dietary, that meats, eggs and cereals produce an excess of acid, that vegetables, fruit and milk produce an excess of bases and that meat should be accompanied by potatoes rather than grain to neutralize its acids.

There is not a word of truth in any of these statements. The mistake made by the experts is in considering all these forms of food in their effects after having been ruined by heat in cookery. Of the uninjured articles these same claims cannot be made; so they are not worth making at all.

The one great truth put forward in this account or report is that potatoes are a very valuable article of food, but it is excruciatingly laughable to note the childish innocence of these would-be scientists. Yes, potatoes are valuable. What is remarkable is that they are a thousand times more valuable than these or any other present day scientists imagine. They do not need the aid of meat to make them valuable. They are just as nutritious taken alone as is meat. You can nearly die in two weeks eating cooked meat; more nearly die

than if you were eating nothing. But you cannot begin to die on an exclusive diet of properly prepared potatoes uninjured by heat, if you keep on same for a whole year. In fact, you will not notice that your health has suffered at all. I know what I am talking about, as I have "been there" on both.

Explanations are in order, but science will have to begin over again. Possibly, when we live a year on a diet of potatoes we get our nitrogen largely from the air, as do peas in a garden. When you try this regimen, you, with your "scientific" preconceptions, will think you are dying from day to day: but, keeping right on, you realize that you never felt better in your life. But whatever the explanation, facts are facts, and science has not made a beginning as yet.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

Fall River, Mass., May 1, 1915.

From the New York Tribune of 1916, Jan. 13.

WHAT APPLES MIGHT DO.

Dire Possibilities Lurk in One Each Day.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In a recent editorial entitled "An Apple a Day," The Tribune rushes in where angels fear to tread. The State Commissioner of Foods and Markets is quoted, but this only surprises the reader the more to learn that there are two men that can take so much for granted. The advice is given to eat an apple a day. This is certainly rash advice in view of the present development of dietetic science. Just think of the malic acid in 365 apples a year.

What does science know about the effects of so much use of this compound? No test longer than three months has been made of apples as an exclusive diet, while it would take a year of exclusive use to determine their value as food. Unless they are a good monodiet, they are not good. Again, what of the large quantities of inorganic matter contained in the juice, or, rather, sap, of the apple? If science knows any one thing it is that the human cannot subsist on minerals, and that minerals in general are detrimental when ingested. The pulp of the apple is vegetable and fit for human food. The sap may be fit food for the plant, but not for man. Again, does not the editor know that apples and cooked starch food will loosen his teeth? Has he never had the experience? And what reason has he to believe that laxative foods are any better than laxative drugs?

Apples have a very good reputation, but the question is whether they deserve it. As the universal custom is to eat food in variety, no one knows the effects of anything. These things cannot be found out in a laboratory. No one is excusable for giving advice on what to eat unless he has experimented on himself for twenty or thirty years, for there is no other available source of knowledge. Apples

have been credited with relieving rheumatism, but the improvement may have been due to substituting this fruit for something still worse. Perhaps the editor knows of people who do, as a matter of fact, eat an apple a day the year round and enjoy health, but he also knows of tobacco users who are not dead as yet. The safest suspicion is that apples are incompatible with many kinds of food, and should not be eaten every day in the year if these other foods are not tabooed. If Tom, Dick and Harry only had the faintest conception of how little is known about human foods they would never venture to offer advice until the research institutes spend a few millions on real experiments.

EDGAR D. BRINKERHOFF.

Fall River, Mass., Jan. 10, 1916.

EDUCATION

From the New York Tribune of 1913, Dec. 24.

CATCHING UP WITH CADMUS.

A Simplifier Urges the Need of a Complete Phonetic Alphabet.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Once upon a time language was represented by pictures, hieroglyphics and other primitive means. Along came Cadmus, a crank, who proposed a new method. Said he, "Let's represent words by a visible character to stand invariably for each phonetic sound in the word, and let us place these letters in the order in which the sounds occur in the spoken word." His proposal has done the world more good than all other proposals combined.

But there are people who have not yet caught up to Cadmus. They want twenty-six letters to do duty for thirty-eight or forty-two sounds. No wonder that English has never become the exclusive world language.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

New York, Dec. 21, 1913.

From the New York Tribune of 1913, Dec. 9.

WHY LEARN TO READ AND WRITE?

Comments on Dr. Montessori.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I quote from to-day's Tribune editorial: "Certain features of the Montessori practice have seemed open to criticism. Her teaching of reading and writing to very young children is one such point." It is not surprising that this is the prevailing opinion when we consider how popular Rousseau is in this country, and when we contemplate the irrational methods of teaching reading adopted by American educators. It did not occur to the author of "Emile" that if reading proved to be a subject unsuited to the child, the fault might be found in the teacher who failed properly to adapt it.

So far as educational doctrine is concerned, Dr. Montessori is carrying coals to Newcastle in traveling to the United States to present a method of teaching reading to very young pupils, for it is in this country that the discovery was made how to teach children four

or five years of age in one day how to read, although it is not carried out in the schools. Let our distinguished visitor direct our school-men and school-women to their own educational philosophers. Cisatlantic pedagogs have much to learn from the great Italian reformer, but they will do well to seek home instruction on the teaching of reading, as this is not Dr. Montessori's strong hand.

In fact, it would not be surprising if the good doctor should gather up on these shores a rational system of teaching the subject and carry it back to Europe and transplant it there to the shame of our misinstructors who are ruining the American child. If reading must be mistaught, let it be postponed to the age of ten or twelve as advised by Rousseau, but if it can be taught in one day, the sooner the learner is put in possession of this great means of education, the better.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

Fall River, Mass., Dec. 5, 1913.

HEROES

From the New York Tribune of 1913, October 25.

MORE AID FOR SULZER.

Another \$10 Is Offered to Help Pay His Debts.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have been looking for an honest man all my life, and at last my efforts are crowned with success. It is easy enough to be honest in the absence of stress. If William Sulzer committed any slight irregularities earlier he has my forgiveness and will have that of the American people. It is a question, anyhow whether lax attention is not justifiable as to such a law. For my part, I would like to see a few millions spent electing honest men or paying their expenses or debts while wearing themselves out in a campaign.

As the Tribune was good enough to forward for another contributor, I take the liberty to inclose check for \$10 toward enabling Sulzer to pay his debts, and will appreciate your kindness in remailing same to him.

People of all parties will vindicate him and the State of New York and themselves by re-electing him Governor at the next gubernatorial election. And I am not altogether sure that he is not of Presidential calibre when it is considered that his honesty towers far above that of the ordinary aspirant.

New York, Oct. 22, 1913.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

[The \$10 inclosed has been forwarded by The Tribune to Mr. Sulzer.—Ed.]

From the New York Tribune of 1911 Sept. 28.

GEN. GRANT AT CHATTANOOGA.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: It is with vexation that I read The Tribune's unfair treatment of General U. S. Grant in the series of war articles running through the Sunday edition.

It is not adulation that I am looking for, but no one would dream of the part played by Grant in the Chattanooga campaign to judge from the account given. A Copperhead would have written a higher appreciation.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

Sept. 26, 1911.

From the New York Tribune of 1916, April 17.

A GENERAL AMNESTY DECLARED.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Good for The Tribune! I will forgive it now for all the damnable things it has done in the last fifty years, since I first began to read it. I will even overlook its hellish record on the Jap-Russ war, when it used to misrepresent everything.

In nominating Teddy The Tribune has in a great measure wiped out the wickedness it has committed in teaching false doctrines in all sorts of subjects; money, tariff, medicine, taxation, education, world peace and what-not.

Let me call your attention to my 1912, August 16, letter, containing the following: "It will be hard for some of us to forgive The Tribune for its treatment of Roosevelt."

EDGAR D. BRINKERHOFF.

Fall River, Mass., April 13, 1916.

From the New York Tribune of 1911, Dec. 13.

A VOICE ON THE OTHER SIDE.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: There is one aspect of the passport agitation that seems to be overlooked, namely, Russia's internal difficulties in the matter. In a country where one race is hated by another as the Jews are hated in Russia, some allowance must be made for the hesitancy of the government about taking any action that may lead to further racial troubles.

The Russian Emperor is liberal, modern, humane, and the greatest reformer of the present age. His attitude toward modern European passport methods cannot be doubted, but the very fact of his having assumed the role of a reconstructor makes it doubly hard for him to take up a reform that has no direct bearing on the main political improvements for which he stands. Let Americans who are so exercised over this question stop long enough to reflect whether it is not an inopportune time to urge a policy contrary to Russian laws when constitutional government in that country still hangs in the balance.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

Irvington, N. J., Dec. 7, 1911.



**This series of pamphlets has in view great objects
which will be announced later.**

